

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/797,129	03/11/2004	Yasuyuki Nomizu	250257US2	4665	
22850 OBLON SPIX	7590 06/17/200 /AK MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			HUNG, YUBIN		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/17/2008	EL ECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/797,129	NOMIZU, YASUYUKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
YUBIN HUNG	2624		

	YUBIN HUNG	2624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w	hich places the
for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to 	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply re-evived by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection (s) filed after a filed			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		,	· ·
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			
	/Yubin Hung/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2624	
	,		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 1, 7, 12, 20 and 24 were amended to include new limitations that would require further consideration and search. (Note that the new limitations of claims 1, 7, 12, 20 are different from the canceled limitation of claim 5 in that in claim 5 the determination is on whether the contents are reflected o the image data in the form of reversible code or the original image. However, in amended claims 1, 7, 12, 20 the determination is on whether contents were performed by the clent or the external apparatus. The sense is true for claims 24 and 28. Additionally, per Fig. 8, refs. S13-515 and P, 35, line 19-P, 35, line 19. 25, the determination is on whether the contents are "to be" (not "were" as in the amended claims) performed in the "Own" (i.e., client) or the external apparatus. Therefore the new limitations have no support in the instant specification.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive. See Item 3 above. Regarding the USC 112 first paragraph rejection, note that "applying" defil/modify contents to an image and its reversible codes are two very different things. While the word "Apply" is used in S7 (Fig. 5) and S19 (Fig. 3), P. 30, lines 3-16 clearly discloses that the edition/modifying operation is applied to the decoded imace, not to the code itself.